

PLANNING IN COLUMBUS, OHIO: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

Jane M. McMaster

Abstract

Columbus has experienced planning in phases common to many areas of this country. Concern 1860-1900 was for adequate water supply, sanitation, and sewage disposal. Columbus was swept along with the City Beautiful Movement, 1900-1920, when groups led by the Chamber of Commerce pushed for more and better parks. They organized the Park Commission (1905 report) and the City Plan Commission (1908 report), both chaired by Charles Mulford Robinson. From 1920 to 1950 functional and social considerations dominated. Consultant Robert Whitten was selected to write a zoning ordinance in 1922 and thus the Columbus Planning Commission was born out of need for a group to administer zoning. The Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954 led to a twelve volume study by Bartholomew (1954) and a 1959 study by a ULI panel. Studies undertaken from 1964 to 1968, called "The Blue Plan," involved more than twenty-five civic groups and resulted in a Comprehensive Regional Center Plan in 1968. Emphasis in the 1970s was on neighborhood data profiles, an "Action Program for Downtown Columbus" by Vincent Ponte, and reports on Capitol Square, the Old Town Quarter, and the Sawmill Corridor. Planning efforts in Columbus met with mixed success because: (1) the business community has not built a broad consensus for planning; (2) there has been no strong leadership to implement plans; (3) the Planning Commission is limited to an advisory role, and (4) a competitive rather than a cooperative spirit exists between the city and the county planning agencies.

Moderator: Carl A. Saladino

Respondent: Carl A. Saladino

PLANNING IN COLUMBUS, OHIO: A Documentary History

(Superscript numbers in the text refer to the end notes; numbers in parenthesis correspond to entries in the bibliography.)

Columbus, Ohio, has experienced planning in phases common to many urbanizing areas in this country from the 1860's to the 1970's. Documents generated in each phase are useful not only in themselves but also as part of a pattern of planning as it developed in Columbus.

The first concern in the 1860 to 1900 period was for the public welfare in securing basic services. Topping the list was the need for an adequate water supply to serve the growing population and also to battle destructive fires which were common in the 1860's. The first public water supply system was built in 1871 using the Olentangy River¹ No documentation exists for this first effort but the water supply again became an issue in the 1890's and the documentation supporting construction of Columbus' first major dam, named for the chief engineer, Julian Griggs, is extant. (4)

Another severe problem was the number of typhoid deaths associated with impure water (54 of every 100,000 people in Columbus died of 2 typhoid fever at this time.²) Columbus' first sanitation consultant, Colonel George Waring of Newport, Rhode Island, made recommendations on a sewer system in 1890. The city then contracted with Rudolph Hering, a civil engineer from New York City, considered the dean of sanitary engineering, and John Alvord, an engineer from Chicago, who along with several local experts like Julian Griggs, wrote reports detailing

appropriate sewage methods at the turn of the century. (1,2,3,4) The culmination of these studies was the building of a three million dollar waterworks plant, completed in 1908. According to the Chamber of Commerce: "Columbus was the first in the country to develop a water supply with a filtration and softening plant."⁴ It remained the largest of its kind until the 1930's.⁵

Columbus was swept along by the 'City Beautiful' movement for the first twelve years of the new century, when a coalition of city groups led by the Board of Trade (antecedent of the Chamber of Commerce), pushed for more and better parks and playgrounds. They were able to prod the City Council into approving creation of a Park Commission to consider plans for a general park system. Mayor Robert H. Jeffrey appointed eighteen citizens to the Park Commission in 1904, and George Lattimer, an officer of the Board of Trade, was elected chairman. Consulting with the group were Austin Lord, an architect from New York City, Charles Lowrie, a landscape architect from New York City, and Charles Mulford Robinson of Rochester, New York, declared by the Columbus Dispatch to be "one of the most noted landscape architects of the country."⁶ Only Robinson's remarks survive. The text of his report was published in the Dispatch on December 17, 1905.

Based on the information gathered by the Commission and on the findings of the above mentioned experts, a report was made to City Council which had the endorsement of the Public Improvements Committee of the Board of Trade, the City Federation of Women's Clubs, the Playground Association and the newspapers. They essentially asked for another expert group to study "the streets, alleys, parks, boulevards and public grounds,"⁷ a request which City Council approved on September 17, 1906. Five members of the Plan Commission were appointed including the three earlier consultants mentioned and Albert Kelsey, an architect from Philadelphia along with Henry A. MacNeil, a sculptor from New York City. The latter two gentlemen were involved with the design of the McKinley Monument, located on the west side of the State Capitol grounds, which was dedicated by Alice Longworth on September 14, 1906. It is said that some disparaging remarks about the vista from the statue, made by Mrs. Longworth, spurred the prompt action of City Council in approving \$5,000 for the endeavor. This was quite a handsome amount considering that just two years earlier Council had reluctantly approved the creation of the Park Commission with the understanding that all the needed funds would be provided by the private sector.

The Columbus Plan Commission worked through the next year and in February of 1908 released a report titled The Plan of the City of Columbus with Preliminary Suggestions for an Arterial Highway System, a Park System and the Civic Center. (5) Commenting on the plans, the Columbus Dispatch said:

They are very elaborate, highly artistic and provide for a Columbus of 50 to 100 years from now. The immense cost, however, and the many practical impediments in the way, will prevent their being carried out in anything like their entirety. What is denominated the 'Civic Group' being a scheme for the beautification of the section between Broad and State and Fourth and Mitchell Streets is a conspicuous feature of the plans and represents the extreme of the designers' idealism.⁸

Chamber of Commerce annual reports and newspaper accounts of the next few years indicate a continued effort to adopt the plan and also to establish a permanent planning commission for Columbus.⁹ A proposed bond issue in 1912 would have provided initial funding for the portion of the Civic Center east of the Capitol building but there is no evidence that the City Council

approved it for the ballot.¹⁰ The devastating flood of 1913, however, redirected the focus of the civic center piece of the plan to the banks of the Scioto River. This adaptation was supported by Frank Packard, a nationally known Columbus architect and President of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce in 1920, Robert F. Wolfe, publisher of the Columbus Dispatch, and Billy Ireland, popular editorial cartoonist for the Dispatch among many others. These efforts began in earnest with the reconstruction of the Broad Street and Town Street bridges in 1921 and 1922 respectively. Central High School was the first building to be constructed on the west bank of Scioto River in 1924. Its location and design most closely paralleled the 1908 Plan Commission's idea of a Classic Revival armory as the culmination of a mall that was to lead from the State Capitol across the river. During the next thirty years more city and state buildings were added as the Civic Center took shape on a north-south along both sides of the Scioto rather than the east-west orientation of the original plan.

The Chamber of Commerce was less successful in its efforts to persuade the city fathers to create a permanent planning commission.¹¹ On January 30, 1916 the Dispatch carried an article about a proposed ordinance drafted by the Chamber providing for such a commission. Two days later an item in the Dispatch indicated that City Council had dismissed the idea of a city planning body as "...a mere waste of taxpayers' money and (they) held the charter to be sufficient to provide for the proper planning of streets and parks."¹²

The period from 1920 to 1950 saw functional and social considerations gradually take precedence over esthetics. The Ohio Legislature Passed the Zoning and Planning Enabling Act in 1920 and Columbus was eager to institute zoning as a land use control. Robert Whitten, a nationally known zoning expert from Cleveland, was selected as the city's consultant charged with writing a zoning ordinance in 1922. (6) The Columbus Planning Commission was born in that same year, largely as a result of the need for a group to administer the zoning ordinance. It is unfortunate that Columbus, like so many other cities at that time, saw zoning as the panacea for all its planning problems and did not take a broader view of the Commission's potential function in comprehensive long range planning.

Because of the circumstances noted above, the Columbus Planning Commission did not focus on much besides changes to the zoning map from its creation in 1922 through the 1940's, and, in fact, met very infrequently from 1936 to 1950. However, the Commission did publish two traffic surveys—i-in 1926 and in 1927—the latter even included a proposed "Main Thorofare Plan". (7) They also appointed a subcommittee to investigate the opportunities for slum eradication through Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Recovery Act. The subcommittee's findings were published in 1933 but did not generate any action. (8)

Other than these two efforts and two other reports on public recreation by Ohio State University professor Wilbur Batchelor, in 1938 and 1947, (9,10) there are no other significant planning documents from this period. In fact, Columbus was unprepared to benefit to any large extent from Roosevelt era programs because of a lack of planning studies done prior to the mid-1930's. As a reflection of the city's indifference to the planning function, the Commission's financial appropriation was reduced to almost nothing from 1932 through the 1940's. Representative yearly expenditures showing \$7.92 in 1936 and \$13.20 in 1937 Indicate how low a priority planning had in this time period.¹³

After a twenty year period of relative inactivity from 1930 to 1950 when Columbus' interest in planning languished, the decade of the 1950's saw a renewed commitment, largely as a result of the Federal Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954 which provided funds for planning studies and urban renewal projects.¹⁴

The heightened interest in comprehensive planning brought on an increase in the staff for the Columbus Planning Commission when Ernest Stork assumed the directorship in 1950. Shortly thereafter the Planning Commission was designated as the Columbus Urban Renewal Authority to receive federal money for urban renewal projects. Blight surveys were done for the Goodale and Market-Mohawk areas in 1953 and 1954. The first bond issue to support renewal was defeated in 1954, but a second, presented to the voters in 1956, passed and provided funds to begin clearance projects in the Goodale and Market-Mohawk areas. (11,12,14,15)

In the early 1950's the city hired the nationally known consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew Associates of St. Louis to prepare preliminary reports which would constitute an outline for the master planning process. The twelve volume, \$90,000 study touched on the areas of transit, transportation, public buildings, the capital improvement program, schools, housing, the economic base, utilities, land use, the central business district and major streets. (13) Work on this series began in 1954 and concluded in 1957. Unfortunately, many took these base line reports as an end product and rejected them as inadequate for a master plan when, in fact, they were meant to be only the basis for a comprehensive planning process and were adopted as such by City Council.

The Urban Land Institute came to Columbus in 1959 to study the inner belt area. (16) After a week long examination they presented their recommendations which included the need for a master plan for downtown development and creation of an independent organization with an adequate staff and budget to support its planning effort. In response, the Chamber of Commerce formed an Internal committee called the Downtown Action Committee in 1960. Its charge was to help plan and supervise the growth and development of downtown Columbus. This committee joined an earlier Chamber-inspired group, the Development Committee for Greater Columbus, which was created in 1956 to deal with the city's infrastructure problems as they related the overall development plans of the metropolitan area. However, consensus on priorities for the community could not be evoked by these two new groups either. So all that was accomplished was a proliferation of the number of entities having input while no one person or group emerged to consolidate leadership and move the planning process forward in a unified way.

The decade of the 1960's saw emphasis continue to be on highways and urban renewal and the strong desire by the Chamber of Commerce to see comprehensive planning instituted. This time their focus was countywide. The Franklin County Planning Commission had been created in 1943, and it became the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission in 1950. The Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission came into being in 1969 when the townships contiguous to Franklin County were added to the jurisdiction of the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.

It was the Chamber and its auxiliary groups, the Downtown Action Committee and the Development Committee for Greater Columbus who decided in 1964 to embark on a massive planning effort to include the entire county's land use and transportation systems. The Coordinating Committee which drew its leadership from the groups mentioned above, called this first comprehensive attempt at regional planning the "Blue Plan". (19) It involved coordination of input from 26 civic and governmental organizations and it began with a total saturation promotional campaign which did an outstanding job of informing the public about the need for such a plan. Over the next few years a great deal of data collection took place. In fact there is a nine page bibliography listing all of the reports that were generated by the "Blue Plan".⁶

In an analysis done by the Battelle Memorial Institute for the Chamber of Commerce it was clear, however, that the program was flawed.¹⁷ Battelle found that there was no explicit statement of what was to be accomplished, when, and by whom, nor was there a detailed plan of how to

implement any conclusions that were reached. The "Inventory and Analysis" studies did not proceed to the next logical step of what to do with the information that was gathered. Also, some redundant information-gathering activities could have been eliminated if there had been more careful attention paid to analysis of data which was already available. Battelle's findings indicated that inventories should not have substituted for decision-making and research alone could not bring the promise that a desired action would automatically follow. According to Battelle, administrative problems also existed. It was difficult to determine who was in charge. They recommended:

1. The Chamber should insist on preparation and adherence to time and cost schedules.
2. "Blue Plan" personnel should be supplemented with outside consultants.
3. There: should be a five year countywide capital improvements budget.
4. A public information campaign should be keyed to the needed changes.¹⁸

The thrust of the "Blue Plan" owed much to Kline Roberts, executive director of the Chamber of Commerce, who was also at this time chairman of the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission and a director of the Ohio Planning Conference. The Coordinating Committee had hoped, Battelle's recommendations notwithstanding, that Roberts' broad participation in the planning process could bring about implementation of the "Blue Plan" objectives. But as had happened in previous planning efforts, there was simply no consensus-building on the order of priorities so that decisions could be made to move the planning process forward.

In August of 1966, the Coordinating Committee shifted responsibility for the direction of the "Blue Plan" to the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission. As a follow up to one of the recommendations made by the "Blue Plan", the city of Columbus made available \$176,000 to undertake a regional center study in 1967. Three consulting firms were selected: Hammer, Green Siler & Associates of Atlanta to do an economic study of the area; Marcou, O'Leary & Associates of Washington, D. C. to plan the land use portion; and Barton Aschman & Associates of Chicago to formulate transportation plans and study parking and traffic circulation through downtown Columbus. The Regional Center Plan and Program—Columbus, Ohio was published by Marcou, O'Leary in 1968 and included development and renewal strategies, public improvements, urban design analysis and working papers for the Community Renewal Program study area. (20) Recommendations in the plan called for:

...future development [to] be channeled to strengthen the existing core of downtown and improve the quality of its environment. With intensive rather than extensive development, office and retail growth would promote the creation of a highly compact and concentrated core.¹⁹

The recommendation was ignored when the County Commissioners chose to build the Courthouse complex at the southernmost point on High Street within the innerbelt and the Nationwide Insurance Company along with the Convention Center chose to build at the northernmost point on High Street within the innerbelt, setting up two activity centers with a lot of under utilized land in between them.

Another suggestion was that governmental action be limited. The consultants said:

By focusing on strategic redevelopment that can set off a chain reaction of follow-up investment throughout the entire downtown area, private market forces can be energized. Massive clearance through slow-moving public renewal action can thus be avoided.²⁰

This advice was also disregarded as the city embarked on the Capitol South Urban Redevelopment Plan which involved buying up a three block retail area on South High Street in the early 1970's and clearing it. Construction has yet to begin fifteen years later on the site set aside for an urban shopping mall.

In 1969, just after the Marcou, O'Leary report above, was made public, the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission published the Franklin County Comprehensive Plan as the culmination of its "Blue Plan" work. (21) It summarized four reports: The 1985 Open Space Plan (22) produced by the Commission, the Water-related Facilities Plan (23) by Burgess & Niple, the Short Range Program for Transit (24) by Alan Voorhees and Associates and the Recommended Development Standards and Objectives for Franklin County, (25) also written by the Commission. In addition, the OSU Bureau of Business Research made countywide economic and population projections.

In the area of urban renewal, the Columbus Community Renewal Program and the Columbus Improvement Program were both undertaken in the late 1960's to provide a framework for receiving federal funds for renewal projects. Projects were continued in the Goodale and Market-Mohawk clearance areas and were initiated in the Children's Hospital clearance area and the Dennison-Hunter-Hubbard conservation area.

The most popular approach to planning in the 1970's in Columbus was to think of it as an evolving process and to identify physical planning units throughout the city and then profile their backgrounds and needs so that solutions to problems could be projected on an ongoing basis. This had been done earlier but in a piecemeal fashion (for example, the Northland Area Study in 1964 (18) and the Near East Side Preliminary Planning Report in 1962.(17)

Ironically, this process happened twice in the 1970's. The first series was called The Columbus Plan 1970-1990 and it included sections for objectives and policies, 40 area plans and implementation methods. It was to be updated at intervals to keep pace with physical changes and community consensus. (26) However, the series concluded in 1971 when there was a change of city administrations. The new head of the Department of Development, N. Jack Huddle, called for a reassessment of the neighborhood boundaries for each of the 40 area plans. (27) This eventually led to the scuttling of The Columbus Plan and another series, called Columbus Planning Area Profiles with 27 designated planning areas, began in 1976. (29) The intent with this series as with the earlier one was to have "planning tools that need not be reinvented each decade but would serve as a basic community oriented system for planning and action."¹⁹ (Unfortunately, in the next change of administration, the commitment has not been maintained to keep this information current—nothing has been added since 1979.)

In 1973 the city invited yet another distinguished planner, Vincent Ponte of Montreal, to analyze the needs of Columbus' central business district and to make some recommendations. His report was issued in four parts as an Action Program for Downtown Columbus. (28) He advocated returning Broad Street to a boulevard with a tree lined median, a High Street transit mall, second level pedestrian walkways and parks along the riverfront and at the north and south portals of the downtown area. The only recommendation to have been implemented in any meaningful way was the last one. The others have had varying stages of discussion and no

significant action.

In addition to downtown planning, the late 1970's became a time for more interest to focus on neighborhood commercial revitalization. Studies were done for North High Street in the university area, (30) Clintonville, (31) North Linden, (32) Mount Vernon Avenue, (33) the Near East Side 4 34) and the Old Town Quarter. (35)

While Columbus has followed a progression in planning common to many other cities, its efforts have met with decidedly mixed results for several reasons. One is that in Columbus it has consistently been the business community who has called for planning—and it has been almost exclusively concerned with the central business district. This call has been met early and often with little enthusiasm or outright indifference from city government and with a bit of suspicion from other groups such as social service agencies and organized labor. Therefore, it has seldom been possible for business interests to build a broad consensus for their ideas, as for instance, Cincinnati has.

Nor has Columbus had the strong leadership to follow through with long term goals once they are presented. With the exception of Robert Wolfe, publisher of the Dispatch, and his efforts after the 1913 flood on behalf of a riverfront civic center, Columbus has not had leaders who have been effective in pushing an idea consistently like the civic leaders in Cleveland who were able to promote their Group Plan for public buildings with great success in the early 1900's.

Columbus has shown foresight in many instances choosing nationally respected consultants for planning studies but more often than not the documents they produce and the recommendations within them are ignored. This leads to a reinvention-of-the-wheel syndrome which is evident in the documents discussed in this paper. Ideas are sought; they are presented by consultants or local leaders; discussion follows but no action is taken; in a few years more new ideas are sought, which, in fact, turn out to be many of the same ideas from the time before; then the cycle is repeated.

Another factor is that the Columbus Planning Commission (which became the Columbus Development Commission in 1965) has only been given an advisory role in planning matters with City Council reserving the right of final approval. Neither group has been effective in implementing suggested policies but has merely reacted to plans presented by private developers.

Finally, fragmentation of planning responsibility has been a nagging problem. The many groups that have been created over the years suffer the same shortcomings when it comes to building consensus communitywide with regard to priorities and leadership. This spills over into the governmental sector for those agencies charged with planning functions. The Franklin County Regional Planning Commission (known as the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission since 1970) is made up of Columbus which has always felt underrepresented, and the many smaller entities in Franklin and contiguous counties which have felt threatened by Columbus' size and influence. This situation has led to a lack of coordination resulting in redundant planning efforts and an inability to set common goals for the good of all the citizens in the region. In this regard it is significant to note that the Urban Land Institute made a second visit to Columbus in September of 1985, twenty-six years after their initial visit. One of their main recommendations was a repeat from the 1959 report. They called once again for Columbus to have a. comprehensive plan and for one group to be in charge of administering it with the power to make changes and set policy.²²

NOTES

¹ "The "waterworks" was a well and a system of pipes laid in gravel beds at the confluence of the Scioto and Olentangy

Rivers." Columbus Dispatch Magazine, October 14, 1962.

² "Before the three million dollar waterworks plant was completed 54 out of every 100,000 people in Columbus died of typhoid fever annually in the eight years prior to the filtration plant." Columbus Dispatch Magazine, April 28, 1946.

³ Biographical Dictionary of American Civil Engineers. Washington, D. C. American Society of Civil Engineers, 1972. P.60.

⁴ Columbus, Ohio. Chamber of Commerce. Annual Report, 1912 p. 15.

⁵ Arter, Bill. Columbus Dispatch Magazine, January, 14, 1968.

⁶ Columbus Dispatch, December 17, 1905, p.1.

⁷ American Institute of Architects. Committee on Town Planning. City Planning Progress in the United States. Washington, D.C., Journal of the American Institute of Architects, 1917.

⁸ Columbus Dispatch, February 4, 1908, p.11.

⁹ ibid., November 28, 1912, p.8.

¹⁰ ibid., February 6, 1912. p.1.

¹¹ Columbus Chamber of Commerce. Activities and Accomplishments during the 15 Months Ending June 30, 1916. p.13.

Columbus, Ohio. Chamber of Commerce. Annual Report, 1914-15. p.28.
1913-14. p.
1912. pp. 14-16.

¹² Columbus Dispatch, February 1, 1916, p.1.

¹³ Franklin County Regional Planning Commission. Annual Report, 1954. "Historical Background"

¹⁴ A Study of the Problems of Planning in Columbus; a Joint report of the Downtown Action Committee and the Development Committee for Greater Columbus. 1963 p.5.

¹⁵ Ohio Planning Conference. Newsletter, v. 12 #4, December, 1963, p.1.

¹⁶ "The Blue Plan in Transition," Columbus Business Forum, October, 1966, p.13.

¹⁷ Ohio Historical Society. Ohio Planning Conference. Papers, Manuscript #177 Box 43.

¹⁸ Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce. Staff Report on the Comprehensive Planning Program, 1964, unpagged.

¹⁹ Marcou, O'Leary & Associates. Regional Center Plan & Program, 1968, p.43.

²⁰ ibid, p.43.

²¹ Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development. Columbus Planning Area Profile #4, 1976, preface.

²² Urban Land Institute. Columbus, Ohio; an Evaluation of Downtown Housing and Retail Strategies. (A Panel Advisory Service Report) Washington, D. C, 1985.

SELECTED CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF COLUMBUS PLANNING DOCUMENTS

1. Griggs, Julian.
Report to the Director of Public Improvements of the city of Columbus, Ohio, on the disposal of the sewage of the city together with plans and estimates of cost. Columbus, Ohio, Charles M. Cott, Book and Job Printer, 1899.
2. Hering, Rudolph.
A Report to the President of the Sewer Commission and Director of Public Improvements on sewerage and sewage disposal for the city of Columbus, Ohio. May 6. 1901. Columbus, Ohio, Franklin Printing Co., 1901.
3. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Public Service.
Improvement of the water supply. Columbus, Ohio, 1904.
4. Columbus, Ohio. Board of Public Service Sewage Testing Station.
Report on sewage purification at Columbus, Ohio, made to the Chief Engineer of the Board of Public Service by George A. Johnson, Engineer in Charge of the Testing Station. Columbus, Ohio, Cott Printing Co., 1905.
5. Columbus, Ohio. Plan Commission.
The Plan of the city of Columbus, report made to the Honorable Charles A. Bond, Mayor, the Honorable Board of Public Service, and the Honorable City Council, by Austin W. Lord, Albert Kelsey, Charles N. Lowrie, Charles Mulford Robinson, H. A. MacNeil, Plan Commission, February, 1908. Columbus, Ohio, 1908.
6. Whitten, Robert Harvey.
Columbus zone plan; a report outlining a tentative zone plan for Columbus, Ohio, by Robert Whitten, Consultant, and A.H.C. Shaw, Engineer for the City Planning Commission, 1923.
7. Columbus, Ohio. City Planning Commission.
Traffic Survey of 1926. Columbus, Ohio, 1926.
Another survey was done in 1927 which includes a tentative "Main Thorofare Plan".
8. Columbus, Ohio. City Planning Commission.
Report of the N.I.R.A. Housing Project Committee. Columbus, Ohio, 1933.
9. Batchelor, Wilbur C.
A Report on a study of public recreation in Columbus, Ohio, 1938. Columbus, Ohio, 1939.
10. Batchelor, Wilbur C.
Recreation survey and long-range plan, city of Columbus, Ohio. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Edwards Brothers, 1949.
11. Nissen, Carl Andrew.
Blight survey of the Goodale study area. Columbus, Columbus Urban Redevelopment Authority, 1953.
12. Jacobson, Alver Hilding.
Blight survey of the Market-Mohawk study area. Columbus, Columbus Urban Redevelopment Authority, 1954.
13. Harland Bartholomew and Associates.
 1. A Report upon economic base, population and land use. (1954)
 2. A Report upon major streets and transit. (1954)
 3. A Report upon the central business district. (1955)
 4. A Report upon utilities and housing. (1954)
 5. A Report upon schools parks and recreation. (1954)
 6. A Report upon housing within the Columbus urban area. (1955)
 7. A Report upon land use and zoning. (1956)
 8. A Report upon the Capital Improvements Program. (1956)
 9. A Report upon transportation. (1956)
 10. A Report upon public buildings and services. (1956)
 11. A Report upon transit. (1956)
 12. Summary report and master plan. (1957)
 All prepared for the Columbus Planning Commission and the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission. St. Louis, Harland Bartholomew Associates, 1954-1957.
14. Columbus, Ohio. City Planning Commission.
Central residential area of Columbus: a neighborhood analysis. Columbus, 1956.
15. Real Estate Research Corporation. Chicago.
Analysis of the marketability of land in the Market-Mohawk area. Chicago, 1956.
16. Urban Land Institute.

- The Innerbelt area, Columbus, Ohio; a report to the city of Columbus, Ohio. Washington, D. C, Urban Land Institute, 1959.
17. Columbus, Ohio. City Planning Commission.
Near east side; a preliminary planning report. Columbus, Ohio, 1962.
 18. Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Northland area study—land use, community facilities, streets. Columbus, Ohio. 1964.
 19. Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Blue plan for the central Ohio community. Columbus, Ohio, 1966-1969.
This massive planning effort involved both the Franklin County Regional Planning Commission and the Columbus Planning Commission in cooperation with Ohio State University, the United Community Council, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce, the Development Committee for Greater Columbus, the League of Women Voters and many other civic groups. The product of their studies was to be a comprehensive regional plan for Columbus and Franklin County with an emphasis on the physical aspects of the environment, (e.g. land use, transportation, and community facilities. They also planned to study social, economic and cultural considerations and reflect them in the proposals for physical Improvements. There were eleven phases involved in the process:
 - Phase I. Preparation of base maps and aerial photos; preparation of manuals of procedure to guide study efforts.
 - Phase II. Inventories and surveys to identify and -quantify data.
 - Phase III. Analysis and review of data to determine planning implications.
 - Phase IV. Forecast to produce probable picture of 1975 and 1985.
 - Phase V. Formulate goals.
 - Phase VI. Problem identification.
 - Phase VII. Policies formulation.
 - Phase VIII. Standards formulation.
 - Phase IX. Preparation of alternative plans.
 - Phase X. Selection of the plan.
 - Phase XI. Implementation of the plan.
A partial list of the studies done for the "Blue Plan" include:

Citizens Research, Inc. Columbus, Ohio
Capital improvements activity in the Franklin County region, 1954-1964. (1966)
Ohio State University. Bureau of Business Research.
The Columbus area economy, structure and growth, 1950- 1985. (1966)
Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce.
Goals for the region; discussion papers for the "Blue Plan" seminars. (1965)
Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
Inventory and analysis of public educational facilities in Franklin County. (1966)
Burgess & Niple.
Inventory and Analysis of water-related facilities in Franklin County. (1966)
Baker, Francis J.
Physical studies of Franklin County. (1966)
Franklin County Planning Regional Planning Commission.
Residential land use inventory and analysis. (1967)
Columbus Hospital Federation.
Hospital and related health facilities study. (1968)
Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Parking inventory and analysis for Ohio State University and environs. (1968)
Comprehensive Regional Plan of Columbus & Franklin County.
The Preliminary regional development guide for Columbus and Franklin County. (1968)
Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Analysis and forecast of local state and federal government facilities. (1969)
Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Analysis and forecast of industrial activity. (1969)
Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
A Preview of the regional plan for 1985. (1969)

20. Marcou, O'Leary & Associates.
Regional Center Plan and Program Columbus, Ohio. Columbus. 1968.
21. Franklin County Regional Planning Commission
Franklin County Comprehensive Plan. Columbus, Ohio, 1969
22. Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
1985 Open space plan for central Ohio. Columbus, Ohio, 1969.
23. Burgess & Niple.
Water-related facilities plan.
24. Alan M. Voorhees & Associates.
A Short range program for transit. Columbus, Franklin County Regional Planning Commission, 1969.
25. Franklin County Regional Planning Commission.
Recommended development standards and objectives for Franklin County. Columbus, 1969.
26. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
The Columbus Plan, 1970-1990. Columbus, Department of Development, 1970-1972.
This was a new approach to planning in Columbus which was designed for the "...regulation of the city's growth, not to regiment Columbus' development but to provide a frequently revised evaluation of what forms development seems likely to take and by coordinating projections for the city's various sectors-to promote a greater coherence in the community as a whole." (Columbus Department of Development. Annual Report, 1970, p.2)
The plan had three major components:
 PART I Objectives and Policies
 This report provided the framework for all the other Columbus Plan reports, as an indexed, codified statement of principles.
 PART II Plans
 This section was divided into two subgroups:
 Section A Function Plans
 Citywide reports on major urban functions like land use, community facilities, highway transportation, economic development, etc.
 Section B Area Plans
 Approximately forty different neighborhoods were identified and profiled.
 PART III Implementation Studies
 These reports identify methods for implementing the objectives and policies and the plans. They are divided into three sections:
 Section A Human Resources
 These reports propose solutions to problems in housing, welfare, education, cultural development, pollution control, etc.
 Section B These reports suggest alternatives for organization of space, technology, and architectural image.
 Section C Administrative Resources
 These are detailed technical studies of the budgeting, scheduling and organization of people and the revision or addition of ordinances necessary to carry out the function and area plans outlined in Sections A and B. Only Part I and Part II Section B (of which there were 38 reports completed) received wide distribution. In Part III only Section C was published. The topics covered were: the University District, Zoning and Annexation. With the change of city administrations in 1972, this plan was abandoned.
27. Sims, William R.
Neighborhoods: Columbus neighborhood definition study. Columbus, Department of Development, 1973.
When Tom Moody became the Mayor of Columbus in 1972, he chose Jack Huddle as the new Director of the Department of Development. Mr. Huddle contracted with Ohio State University professor, William R. Sims : to research and redefine the neighborhood boundaries in Columbus. Sims came up with 27 areas—eleven fewer than had previously been used for the Columbus Plan mentioned above. These divisions were then the basis for publishing the Columbus Area Planning Profiles to be mentioned below.
28. Columbus. Downtown/Action Planning Program.
Action program for downtown Columbus. Columbus, Downtown Action/Planning Program, 1973
In 1973 the city of Columbus hired noted planning consultant, Vincent Ponte, who, along with Travers Associates and Nitschke-Godwin-Bohm, analyzed the needs of the downtown core of Columbus. Their

recommendations were presented in four parts: access and circulation, pedestrian walkways, High Street and Broad Street.

29. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development. Division of Planning.
Columbus planning area profile series; community planning areas 1-27. Columbus,. Department of Development, Planning Information Center, 1976-79.
This series was begun after the neighborhood definition study by William Sims, mentioned above, and represented an effort to provide the most complete and current information available for ongoing planning and decision-making activities. Three phases were to be implemented as follows:

Phase 1	Information Providing a current planning information base consisting of. collection of all available relevant planning data. The Information Profiles were the product of the first phase. Their organization allowed for continuous updating and expansion of information.
Phase 2	Analysis Analyzing the available data in the 27 planning areas to identify problems and opportunities in a given area.
Phase 3	Action Developing guidelines for action based on the results of Phase 2. These guidelines were to address all physical development, redevelopment and preservation activity over the next 15 years.

The intent of this set of documents was to provide Columbus with a". . .series of planning tools that need not be reinvented each decade but will serve as a basic community oriented system for planning and action that can be modified, expanded and refined as needed over the ensuing years." (Community Planning Area Profile #4, 1976, preface) With the change of city administrations in 1984, this approach was abandoned.
30. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
University/High Street report and project recommendation. Columbus, Department of Development, 1977.
31. Columbus, Ohio, Department of Development.
Clintonville economic development study. Columbus, Department of Development, 1977.
32. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
North Linden market study. Columbus, Department of Development, 1977.
33. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
Mount Vernon Avenue: sketch plan for commercial revitalization and an urban design framework. Columbus, Department of Development, 1977.
34. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development.
Near east side; small business restoration study. Columbus, Department of Development, 1977.
35. Columbus, Ohio. Department of Development. Division of Planning.
Old town quarter; action program for commercial redevelopment. Columbus, Nitschke Associates, 1979.